

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 379

EA 008 170

AUTHOR Wirt, Frederick M.
TITLE Reassessment Needs in the Study of the Politics of Education.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 76
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; Conflict; Data Collection; Education; *Educational Research; *Politics; Research Design; *Research Methodology; Social Values; *Systems Analysis; Theories

ABSTRACT

This essay is an inventory of the needs that the author hopes will serve to stimulate others to reassess and revise their basic thinking and analysis about the politics of education. It points to continuing needs in basic theory, concepts, research design, data collection, and analytical methods. (Author/IRT)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED122379

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REASSESSMENT NEEDS IN THE STUDY OF THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION

Frederick M. Wirt
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois, Urbana

Prepared for delivery at the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, April 23, 1976.

EA 008 170

REASSESSMENT NEEDS IN THE STUDY OF THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION

To be asked to reflect on the status and future of a body of scholarship is humbling, because it is always easier to describe the present than to prescribe the future. Mark Twain was probably correct in urging that, if called upon to predict, always do so at least a century ahead; that way, no one will be around to judge you. Rather than prediction, then, this paper is an essay in the mode of "Where should we go from here?"

Such quo vadis thinking represents in one sense a sophisticated gripe list about insufficiencies that have come my way as I have written and read in the politics of education. It is a quite fascinating field, for its newness, its spanning of different disciplines, its diversity of methods--and for its many occasions when I ask "Why isn't there any....?" Being an editor for a series of volumes in this field is one way of getting rid of such concerns about intellectual needs, but more basic needs still remain untouched. This essay is an inventory of those needs which I hope will serve to stimulate others to reassess and revise their basic thinking and analysis about this subject. If only one of the following is achieved as a result of this paper, I will have succeeded surpassingly.

This reassessment follows a simple outline. It points to continuing needs in basic theory, concepts, design, data collection, and analytical methods. With Mercutio, I suggest of this inventory: 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door, but 'tis enough, 'twill serve.

Theoretical Frameworks

The lament for "better theory" is always with us, if we are a growing body of knowledge. For it is new theory which recasts old wisdom and provokes new questions, providing a dynamic force to scholarship. Our study is no different. Quite frankly, the best theory we now have is only descriptive, i.e., the heuris-

tic framework of "systems analysis." Not even David Easton has ever claimed more than that for it; he carefully denies it is "theory" in the sense discussed below, as I have noted elsewhere.¹ Its utility is that of any heurism, i.e., a superior way to classify diverse phenomena into fewer categories, thereby increasing the opportunity to detect interrelationships. But predictive theory is not heuristic theory, and it is the former which many of us yearn for.²

The prevalence of systems analysis, now almost having the status of the traditional, carries several major drawbacks which inhere in any systematic thinking. In essence, it is an enlarged metaphor seeking to relate and explain the inchoate world of experience to a familiar and tested experiential framework. It may be, as Martin Landau has argued, that this is possibly the best theory the social sciences are capable of at this time, and that, indeed, it carries several utilities.³ But that is not the same as urging use of only a single metaphor/theory. Whether we accept new theories cumulatively, in response to canons of verification and testing, or by revolutionary but uncritical adoption of new metaphors, there is need for a competition of such ideas of explanation.⁴ Such competition insures that our perspectives and questions are not narrowed in seeking to explain a world of phenomena that is wide.

Another limitation of systems analysis, or any singular framework of analysis, stems from the language of the prevailing metaphor. Language narrows thought, as linguists always point out, and the particular language one employs in social research focuses our vision, energies, and queries. When group theory was fashionable, collectivities real and potential, visible or mystic, captured our expressions of the political context. It is not that group theory was invalid, for it can still provide important insights into the politics of school administration.⁵ Nor is it that such theory went unchallenged, for surely it did

not. Rather, group theory demonstrates the way in which it channels language perception, just as today systems analysis has us all seeing inputs, withinputs, outputs, and outcomes. As one who has used this framework extensively in writing about schools, my concern does not come from lack of experience with these ideas.

Besides the blinders which metaphors and their constraining language impose, there is a concern about systems analysis which has been noted quite early, and which its author has always attested to. This is its inability to provide us with the basis for testable hypotheses, the basic material of the inductive mode now dominating social sciences research. Many scholars in this field have noted this problem,⁶ but like Mark Twain's comment about the weather, no one is really doing much about it. Certainly a new theory, whatever its captivating metaphor, must provide the chance to generate propositions about causal relations among the many factors in the environment of school politics. That is probably the major need facing this scholarship as it undertakes a reassessment.

An Alternative Framework of Analysis

Accordingly, I take this opportunity to sketch out some ideas which I am amused to think have theoretical components. They stem from observations not merely in school politics, but in the transformation of American city politics recently, in the evolution of suburban politics, and in the effort of the national government to implement national goals upon the mosaic of American federalism. Because I raise this here only to share such thoughts with those who have primary interests in theory, it is designed to stimulate that discussion.

From two decades of turbulence in politics and policy, I am struck by the evident disequilibrium between needs, expectations, and wants on the one hand, and on the other, the resources of money and knowledge, as well as the capacity of policy systems. In short, there is a gap between expressed human needs and

the ability of decision-making bodies to meet them. I see in this social and political disjunction a powerful engine generating political conflict.

Such disjunction between needs and resources underlies many aspects of the policy-making process. Policy originates in the gap between two differing distributions in the society, that of existing resources and that of existing needs. Because there is never enough of the good things of life to go around for all who want them, many needs go unmet. Some of these needs, however, become articulated and mobilized enough to enter social institutions for their resolution; one such institution is the political.

That framework seems to me to describe the basic process stimulating the newly turbulent politics of American schools; schooling needs (more learning, bearable financial cost, greater group recognition, enhanced responsibility for the use of bureaucratic and professional power) have been opposed by the existing set of policies, with their distribution of resources and values.⁷ Efforts to create a new equilibrium between opposing sets of values have generated within the education profession new concerns and new policies about sensitizing administrators and destereotyping curricula.

Similarly, a disjunction between needs and resources generates much of the debate in the implementation stage of policy making over intervention or change-agency strategies, particularly in a federal system where national programs must be worked through a prism of multiple jurisdictions.⁸ Even the evaluation stage of policy making reflects efforts to bring opposed needs and resources into agreement; indeed, a strong case is made that evaluation is heavily value laden.⁹ The never publicized efforts to design a "second Coleman report" by Rand and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights three years ago demonstrates that newly sensitive minorities are aware of the value context of evaluation.

Why would a theoretical approach focusing upon the dynamics of social disjunction do more to generate inductive research? As Fred Kerlinger reminds us in successive editions of his research text, the basic social science question for research is not, Are there observable differences in reality? Rather it is, How can we account for such differences? Viewing politics as a conflict phenomenon means viewing behavioral differences, which ultimately are differences of value. This approach necessarily forces us to account for those observed differences in the political arenas. Easton's writings are replete with a focus upon how to detect differences, indeed, how to classify them. His single effort to add a dynamic element to such heuristic classification--that the whole political system was driven by the effort of political authorities to deal with "stress"--has not been received well, even by those who find the rest of the framework amenable.

But a focus upon the phenomenon of conflicting needs and values, made concrete in actions to protect and enhance those values, provides a more dynamic aspect to research. This arises not merely by bringing our attention to bear upon different values at work in the political process--that is surely not new--but by raising other kinds of questions which are more prone to verification in the inductive mode. This paper is not designed to explore those questions fully, but some of them can be raised here:

- o Because professional and popular values about a policy service cannot be fully congruent, one or the other will dominate in any given period, giving rise to an alternating cycle of value dominance:
- o Corollary: in a democratic system, popular values are more likely to prevail when they peak, and to be incorporated into the professionals' services subsequently.

- o Corollary: over time, professional victories tend to be associated with increasing industrialism and the framework of bureaucracy it generates for all social institutions.
- o What seems to be the policy and politics matrix of a locale or region is rooted in differing mixes of values in such places, i.e., the central city, suburban, and small town/rural politics of education varies in content, actors, and outcomes because of different combinations of people and their values (primarily linked to status) found in such sites.¹⁰
 - o Corollary: the succession of groups new to a locale and with new values about policy generates most school politics conflicts.¹¹
 - o Corollary: this politics of value succession moves through identifiable stages of: closure about old values (traditional acquiescence); challenge by new values; new value-old value balance; dominance by new values; and new value closure.¹²
- o As any jurisdiction becomes open to the influence of outside private and public influences upon policy decisions, the existing distribution of resources becomes altered.¹³
 - o Corollary: increasing outside influence is stimulated by private groups whose values are unmet at lower jurisdictions.¹⁴
 - o Corollary: because the number of participants involved in the decision, as Schartesschneider pointed out 15 years ago, dramatically alters the scope of issues involved, the intensity of the conflict, the rules of the game, and the outcomes, school professionals have a vested interest in keeping the policy arena closed against outside influences, unless losers themselves.

This may well not be much to begin with if we are seeking a departure from the prevailing metaphor of systems analysis. Nor do I believe that the latter must be abandoned in all its aspects. But if we are to move from laments about existing theory to speculation about the new, a start must be made somewhere. It is in that sense that the preceding suggestions are put forth in this reassessment.

Concepts

Concepts refer to those constructs of reality underlying the framework of theory. In the case of our concern, the major concepts are "political" and "educational." The prevailing concept of the political is that of "the authoritative allocation of resources and values." This Eastonian concept has had wide use, and it is this breadth which raises the first reassessment I have had about our prevailing concepts.

Is it not possible that such a definition is so broad and all inclusive that it includes everything that is done within the school? While political scientists would consider this a self-evidence proposition, others, less imbued with a sense of the pervasiveness of politics in life, would wish to question that. Michael Kirst has elsewhere shown the essential political qualities of what most school officials would regard as their most "professional" decision (by which they mean non-political)--curricular decisions.¹⁵ If politics has to do with decisions for a "system," what are the limits of the system? It is "political" when textbook decisions are made by the state, even in providing a set of options, and certainly it is when the district school authority exercises those options by narrowing the list even further, upon advice from central office professionals. But is it "political" if the teacher chooses Text A over Text B, with only those choices before her, because she likes A's readability, its clarity and beauty in

pictures and figures, its stimulus to learning provided by the end-of-chapter questions--and other criteria which she or he regard as "professional," i.e., directly related to furthering the basic task of learning?

Scholars of the political have been saying for a few years now that many school officials are politicians. The effect of this concept upon the professionals, in my experience with Berkeley and Nova University, ranges from the incredulous (rather as if I said they were spitting on the flag) to the indifferent. We have some quite good efforts to define this relationship between the political and the educational,¹⁶ but all of this is at the macro-level. That is, the effort is characterized by broad scope. What it means at the micro-level of, say, the school site or school room is simply not that clear. Dale Mann and Henry Summerfield have separately shown such consequences for school site administrators,¹⁷ but that is not the same as understanding how administrators and other school officials act if they view their role as political.

Part of this difficulty in distinguishing between concepts of the political and the educational lies in our assumptions about the relationship between the political and the educational systems. Bluntly put, is the political system the independent variable, or is it the reverse?¹⁸ Are schools made what they are by action of political mechanisms, or are the latter shaped (in their actors' values and actions) by the influence of a educational system upon them and their constituents? The latter interaction is inherently Platonic in origin, reflecting a long tradition that we should and can train those who use political power to do so in certain desired ways; it is an approach endemic in our university training programs for the public service, including teachers and administrators. The State as the independent variable, molding the School, is also recognizable in history; all political systems seek to have the schools reinforce existing political values and institutions, what V. O. Key called the "conservatizing

influence" of schools.¹⁹

While such a dichotomy is appropriate for purposes of analysis, in reality we know that the two institutions interact. What we do not have, however, is a very good concept of this interactive process. What we do have are discrete cases of one or the other as the independent variable. There are cases of local publics censoring textbooks or removing teachers whose political ideas were suspect. We also have extensive attention given to design of civics curriculum in the training of teachers and administrators, whose purpose surely is to influence children's values about the state. And then we have a recent and extensive literature of political science about political socialization, which shows relatively little influence upon the young in many political matters, compared to that emanating from family, peers, neighborhoods, etc. What we lack in all this, then, is a better specified and defined concept of the patterns of interaction between State and School.

This field is far from depleted in research possibilities, probably because the conceptual basis is fuzzy. One place where such research is needed, which would examine these interactions carefully and in an important area of policy, is the matter of textbook adoption. A guiding proposition might well be based upon perceived threat to the values and power of contemporary decision makers. That is, texts dealing with subjects which most people know little about anyway (e.g., physics) pose little threat by that very fact. Hence, they should not arouse concern or opposition from those in the political and school systems who have the authority to make curricular decisions. Obversely, when the subject possesses wide familiarity among the constituencies of State and School, there is less independence of school authorities to shape and select the product to be used in classrooms. This proposition relates to an earlier concern with social

value disjunction as the generator of policy conflict. But such work requires first a much sharper specification of the meaning of "political" and "educational" and of the lines between them, if any. Remedy of this conceptual fuzziness is crucial to any reassessment of where we shall next go in this field.

Research Designs

The design of research is an important link between our theorizing or conceptualizing about reality and the analysis of the phenomenon of that reality, so its assessment cannot be eschewed. We know of the once prevalent use of the case study in research design, and we know also of the place and temporal limitations on generalization which they have. As Peter Cistone and I have shown in recent, separate collections of school politics research, macroanalysis is now the mode, with the accompanying heavy reliance upon quantitative methods.²⁰ Much of this newer research utilizes research designs which are comparative and institutionally oriented. One thinks of the quite recent study by Ronald Campbell and Tim Mazzoni, Jr. of twelve states' institutions and officials for policy making. Or Joseph Cronin's longitudinal 14-city study of The Control of Urban Schools, and the 80-plus district study of board-superintendent relationships by Harmon Zeigler and M. Kent Jennings.²¹

What we lack, however, is comparative study not of institutions but of process, for it is in interaction that power is displayed and policy is achieved. One recalls the quintessential definition of politics by Harold Lasswell which stresses this interactional focus. Fortunately, such comparative process designs are not lacking in the literature. Joel Berke and Michael Kirst mobilized a set of scholars to study what happened to federal aid to education funds when they came down the pipeline of a half-dozen states in the late fifties and mid-sixties.²⁴ More recently, James Guthrie is producing first results of a study

of many California districts when each delegated to the school site the control over many aspects of budgeting.²⁵

An enormous contribution to the understanding of the basic sources of school policy could be had by a national study of all fifty states, conducted within a similar design and producing, at the least, some understanding of how history, economic resources, and demographic mixes alter policy outputs. I am currently engaged in analysis of the distribution of educational authority by the state to local districts in all fifty states. Using content analysis of 36 areas of school policy to flesh out a dependent variable of state vs. local control, I am seeking explanations of this variation in region, economic environment, political qualities, professionalism, etc. From an understanding of the basic difference in "state policy cultures" produced by differing distributions of state authority, we can proceed to understanding the empirical interactions between state and local levels which give body to the skeleton of statute and regulation. But it is the kind of process study which is badly needed, and to get this we must first deal with another assessment need, data collection.

Data Collection

The design needs posted above necessitate large amounts of state and district data, particularly reactive data about how school authorities operate, so we can construct a picture of institution and process. This is of the kind which Campbell and Mazzone employed for their twelve-state study, i.e., in-depth interviews with designated sets of participants in the policy process. We do have much non-reactive data about budgets, personnel and their training, and programs adopted, the sort which fill the volumes of the National Education Association or the National Center for Educational Statistics of the USOE. But most of these data provide at the best only surrogate indicators of those vital

interactions between and within levels of school policy making. Budgets, we know, have been widely used recently as measures of governmental activity, and they do tell us much. But they cannot explain why two states having the same share of the costs of local schooling or the same degree of personnel training act quite differently when federal programs appear or why they have differing traditions about state vs. local control of schools. Harmon Zeigler and Karl Johnson have clearly shown that in school policy, environmental variables are poor predictors of noneconomic policy outputs.²² Too, a preliminary review in gross terms of the amount of state-mandated policies finds it has little relationship to revenue and expenditures.

In those six states with the most policies (in order, Minnesota, New York, Alabama, Mississippi, Illinois, and Virginia) two are urban, wealthy, high resource, and competitive party states in the Northeast, three others are in the old Confederacy culture with characteristics the opposite of the first two.²³

Achieving these interactional biographies of the fifty states is a major job, requiring foundation or government funding over several years period. A set of fifty monographs should be produced as a base line for understanding the state politics of education, with a set of somewhat smaller size for the biggest cities in America. While the National Institute of Education seems a natural funding source, its task and craft-oriented research agenda is ill-fitted to either this basic research or, indeed, to political science orientation. Given the enormous pressures upon it currently to show that research has "practical" payoffs promptly, NIE can provide little for research that is not directly related to the teaching and learning functions and which does not provide prompt payoffs in "successful" (hence easily disseminated) research.

However, several universities are currently setting up centers for educa-

tional policy research which may attract foundation funding for such a large scale, comparative study. At least one of them would do well to focus upon collection of these data, providing a site where others could find: these monographs; all the state laws and regulations on education (no easy task, incidentally); a library of published and "fugitive" literature on school politics; and raw statistics on fiscal and non-fiscal aspects of the subject. Without such comprehensive sets of information about processes of decision making, much of our work will be limited to sub-national samples, to easily obtained data, (but data not particularly revealing of the realities of the political process), or to survey research (while useful, this deals only with people's perceptions about process, several times removed from the observer-scholar).

One indicator of how theory and concept mean little when design cannot encompass sufficient data sets is the recent study by Ray Jongeward of the school board in the rural community.²⁶ That board looms very large in the nearly 16,000 school districts of the nation, even though it contains a small, and getting smaller, share of the nation's students. Using a computer-assisted search of six major information banks, plus others (including the Dissertation Abstracts International File), Jongeward found in a total file of 1,445,000 items fewer than 100 on rural school boards, the basic policy making authority for most districts in the nation. Consequently we know very little about these decisional processes, including who participates, how problems are dealt with, who controls school functions, how democratic they are, and the qualities of those who are or are not elected to such authority.

If a scholar must write about that large terra incognita of school politics--and most manage not to--the subject seems settled by a reference to

one such place in one study in one time period by Vidich and Bensman.²⁷ That really is not sufficient, for we cannot know how reliable their findings are because we know almost nothing about the universe from which it was drawn. For example, have rural boards become less democratic as population has fled and the area is increasingly dominated by agr-business structures? Does that kind of policy preferred change as the population leaves?²⁸ Do changes in the legislature brought on by Baker v. Carr in 1961 rebound to the benefit or detriment of rural boards? As the Census Bureau reports a swelling of population in many such places remote from the big cities, a change brought on by those in urban flight or retirement, does the nature of school politics change? Are there different school demands traceable to differences in local political culture, whether of the type Daniel Elazar has focused upon, or the type rooted in ethnic differences in rural places?²⁹

Not a single bit of knowledge is available to answer these major questions because data have been unavailable and scholars have lacked interest. Some enterprising scholarly promoter might well think to bring this to the attention of the major farm organizations or the rural segment of the National School Board Association, National Association of School Administrators, House and Senate committees on education, etc. All of this, however, demonstrates the major reassessment we must make in our data collection systems if our research is to be very robust and our generalizations broadly grounded

Analytical Methods

The collection of data under all kinds of designs, reflecting diverse conceptual and theoretical frameworks, places a special burden upon our methods for analyzing such data. Clearly we are well removed from the case study analysis which loomed so large among the literature when I first turned to it six years

six years ago. Having contributed some of those on my own since, I am not ignorant of the advantages of this method. But as this study area moves to macro-analysis, the case study should be constrained to its classic (but rarely found) uses: to illuminate general propositions and to generate new propositions.³⁰

It is our methods for analyzing aggregate data, however, which I wish to raise in this reassessment. While other domains of educational research have relied heavily upon analysis of variance for the chief statistical instrument, our field has moved only slowly into such multivariate analysis techniques. Even in the series of scholarly studies I have commissioned for a special series in this field, none go as far as regression analysis.³¹

I am not all that sorry about that failure, as I have become increasingly dissatisfied with the regression technique for the diffuseness of its results. As currently employed, it gives an impression of analyzing processes when it is actually much more static, dealing only with cross-sectional, and not longitudinal data; clearly, only the latter are appropriate for process studies. Of course, the regression method's efforts to struggle with the multi-causal nature of the social world is a quantum jump beyond the limited robustness of the case method of analysis. And, when there do exist singular associations of great strength in a multi-faceted social context, the technique will reveal its dominance

But so often it is so sensitive to the interaction effects of other factors under analysis that one ends up with an unclear picture of the relational web of association. As someone once said of Parsons' conceptual framework, "Everything is connected to everything else."

One expects to see more than that, whether approaching the study of the politics of education from the perspective of the scholar or of the policy analyst

It may be that we are caught up in the latest stage of successive fads in quantitative methods. A close friend and scholar of statistics (a set of one) has commented to me that we really are dealing with statistically unsophisticated techniques as far as the whole behavioral research of political science is concerned. Because we are beginning to collect longitudinal data which could fit into alternative explanations of the observed phenomena, it may be that someone could pioneer for us in the use of simultaneous equations when we have exhausted the uses of cross-sectional and time-bound data in regression, path analysis, modelling, etc. His explanation of this alternative method's utility made much sense to me as I projected it upon familiar research in political science.

Further, the recent emphasis of evaluation research upon the qualitative factors shaping design, method, and findings should interest us. Not surprising, one field with which such analysis has dealt is education, particularly with what occurs inside the school site and classroom. This attention to non-quantitative analytical problems has not yet produced publications about the politics of education, however, so this method should attract someone to that task. Thus, in reviewing the literature of our field, what are the implicit value assumptions of our research designs? How may certain quantitative techniques shape certain kinds of findings? How may hopes and fears shape evaluation of success in implementation of a school policy, as with the current "minimalist" judgment of national policy consequences? At a broad level, these queries should begin the task of directing attention to the implicit dimensions of our field.

Coda

At the end, I find my words do not meet the concerns I have accumulated over several years. By no means is this an apologia or a counsel of despair. For the growth of knowledge requires a continuing dissatisfaction with what one knows

and with the methods of acquiring it. Hutchins once said no one should be president of a university for more than ten years (this was in the halcyon days before the last decade), because by then he was only a defender of his earlier innovations. If we are to escape the dangers of smugness, a continual challenge must be carried to our assumptions, methods, and findings. This essay is in that tradition.

But this doesn't mean that what we know is useless. As I think of our knowledge now and a decade ago, when the separate works of Bailey and Masters et al. stood as lonely beacons on a shore barren of political substance, I cannot but find pleasure in what we now have. There is excitement in seeing political scientists apply their concepts to the material of school policy, often with a sense of surprise that they fit. Nor do I feel any need to abandon our studies because perfection does not exist. Maybe the pursuit of that excellence (echoes of another decade) there is all we can ask. It is in this sense that Browning offered the appropriate closing on this reassessment, for my concerns about the need for more--in theory and in other matters--is an illustration of his couplet:

"A man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

FOOTNOTES

¹ Frederick Wirt & Michael Kirst, Political and Social Foundations of Education (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975), Part III.

² A basic examination of these differences is A. James Gregor, "Political Science and the Uses of Functional Analysis," American Political Science Review, 62 (1968), 526-49.

³ Martin Landau, "On the Use of Metaphor in Political Analysis," in Landau, Political Theory and Political Science (New York: Macmillan, 1972), Ch. 3.

⁴ Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964); for a critique, see Landau, Ch. 2.

⁵ Harry L. Summerfield, The Neighborhood-Based Politics of Education (Columbus: Merrill, 1971); Harmon Zeigler et al., "Professionalism, Community Structure and Decision Making: School Superintendents and Interest Groups," in Samuel Gove & Frederick Wirt, eds., Scholars, Policy Makers, and School Policy: The Princes and the Pundits (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, forthcoming).

⁶ Gerald Sroufe, "Political Systems Analysis and Research in Educational Administration: Can The Emperor Be Clothed?" paper presented at the convention of the AERA in 1969; Jerome Stephens, "The Logic of Functional and Systems Analysis in Political Science," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 13 (1969), 367-94; Michael Kirst & Edith Mosher, "Politics of Education," Review of Educational Research, 39 (1969), 623-40; Laurence Iannaccone & Peter Cistone, The Politics of Education (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1974), Ch. 2.

⁷ I have developed this framework extensively in recent articles: "Social Diversity and School Board Responsiveness in Urban Schools," in Peter Cistone, ed., Understanding School Boards (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1975), Ch. 10; "Contemporary School Turbulence and Administrative Authority," in Robert Lineberry & Louis Masotti, eds., Toward a New Urban Theory (Boston: Ballinger, forthcoming) and "The State Politics of Education," in Herbert Jacob & Kenneth Vines, eds., Politics in the American States, 3d ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, forthcoming).

⁸ On these multiple jurisdictions, see Edith Mosher, "The School Board in the Family of Governments," in Cistone, Ch. 2. For a review of the problems with one school aid program, see Stephen Crocker et al., A Review of Program Operations: Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Santa Monica: Rand Corp., forthcoming). For a comprehensive review of such programs, see Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV, The Findings in Review (Santa Monica: Rand Corp., 1975).

⁹ The works of Carol Weiss and Peter Rossi are seminal here.

- 10 Wirt, "Social Diversity and School Board Responsiveness in Urban Schools."
- 11 E.g., Laurence Iannaccone & Frank Lutz, Politics, Power and Policy (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1970), and E. P. LeDoux and M. Burlingame, "The Iannaccone-Lutz Model of School Board Change: A Replication in New Mexico," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (1973), 48-65; Frederick Wirt et al., On the City's Rim: Politics and Policy in Suburbia (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1972), 161-66
- 12 E.g., Wirt et al., 172-4.
- 13 E.g., on the disequilibrating effect of the nationalized race issue in schools, see Harmon Zeigler & M. Kent Jennings, Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts (N. Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury, 1974), Ch. 12. The theme runs heavily through the sources cited in note 7. See also Frederick Wirt, Power in the City: Decision Making in San Francisco (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) for explication of the theme in numerous arenas of urban policy, including schools.
- 14 A little noted but highly insightful model of this transfer is Currin Shields, "The American Tradition of Empirical Collectivism," American Political Science Review, 46 (1952), 104-120.
- 15 Wirt and Kirst, Ch. 10.
- 16 Laurence Iannaccone, Politics in Education (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967); Iannaccone and Cistone; Paul Peterson, "The Politics of American Education," in Fred Kerlinger, ed., Review of Research in Education, Vol. 2 (Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1974), 348-89.
- 17 Dale Mann, The Politics of Administrative Representation (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1976); Summerfield.
- 18 This dichotomy has been provocatively raised by Heinz Eulau, "Political Science and Education: The Long View and the Short," in Michael Kirst, ed., State, School and Politics: Research Directions (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1972), 1-9.
- 19 V. O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy (New York: Knopf, 1961).
- 20 Cistone; Frederick Wirt, ed., The Polity of the School (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1975).
- 21 Ronald Campbell & Tim Mazzoni, Jr., State Policy Making for the Public Schools (Berkeley: McCutchen, 1976); Joseph Cronin, The Control of Urban Schools (New York: Free Press, 1973); Zeigler & Jennings.
- 22 Harmon Zeigler and Karl Johnson, The Politics of Education in the States (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972).
- 23 The data are presented in Wirt, "The State Politics of Education."

- 24 Michael Kirst and Joel Burke, Federal Aid to Education (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1975).
- 25 Patricia Craig, "Determinants and Effects of School-Site Management Reform in California Public Schools," paper presented to the American Political Science Association, convention, 1974.
- 26 Ray Jönggward, "The School Board in the Rural Community," in Cistone, Ch.9
- 27 Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958).
- 28 This query is dealt with directly in LeDoux and Burlingame.
- 29 Daniel Elazar, American Federalism, 2d ed. (New York: Crowell, 1972), Ch.4
- 30 George LaNoue and Bruce Smith, The Politics of School Decentralization (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973).
- 31 An exception is the use of Q-factor analysis in Howard Hamilton and Sylvan Cohen, Policy Making by Plebiscite: School Referenda (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1974).